DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 684 UD 020 318

TITLE Martin Luther King Junior Elementary School Children, et. al., Plaintiffs, v. Ann Arbor School District Board, Defendant: Memorandum Opinion and Order. Civil Action No. 7-71861.

INSTITUTION District Court, Detroit, Mich. Eastern District of Michigan Southern District.

PUB DATE 24 Aug 79

NOTE 30p.: Not available in paper copy due to light, broken print

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Black Dialects; *Black Students; Board of Education Policy; *Court Litigation; *Educational Legislation; Elementary Education; *English Instruction; Inservice Teacher Education; *Reading Instruction

IDENTIFIERS *Michigan (Ann Arbor)

ABSTRACT

This document contains the text of a United States District Court decision on a Michigan school district's proposed plan designed to help the teachers at a local elementary school (1) to identify those children who speak Black English and to determine the language spoken as a home or community language, and (2) to employ that knowledge in teaching such children how to read standard English. The plan was ruled acceptable by the Court on the basis that it complies with a Federal law which holds that no State shall deny equal educational opportunity to an individual because of the failure of an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its educational programs. The text of the Ann Arbor School District Board plan is also included in this document. The plan details the method by which teachers will be provided, primarily through inservice training, with the skills necessary to identify speakers of Black English and to teach them to read standard English. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183684

FEB 1 = 1980

22,111
Q
29p.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

MARTIN LUTHER KING JUNIOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ANN ARBOR SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD,

Defendant.

_____/

Civil Action
No. 7-71861

RECEIVED
NATIONAL
FOR

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This court has directed the defendant School District Board to submit a proposed plan defining the exact steps to be taken, (1) to help the teachers of the plaintiff children at King School to identify children speaking "black English" and the language spoken as a home or community language, and (2) to use that knowledge in teaching such children how to read standard English.

UD020318

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This ruling was a result of findings that the School District Board was in violation of Title 20, United States Code, § 1703(f), which reads as follows:

> No State shall deny equal educational opportunity to an individual on account of his or her race, color, sex, or national origin, by -
>
> * * * * *
>
> (f) the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instructional programs.

The court found:

1. That a language barrier existed between the plaintiff children and the teachers in the Martin Luther King Junior Elementary School because of the failure of the teachers to take into account the home language or dialect of the children in trying to teach them to read standard English. This was caused by the failure on the part of the defendant School Board to develop a program to assist the teachers in this respect.

2. That the dialect spoken by the children is a version of English called "black English" and is related to race.

3. That the barrier was one of the causes of the children's reading problems which they all experienced and which impeded the children's equal participation in the school's educational program.

4. That the statute enacted in 1974 by Congress directs the school system to take appropriate action to overcome the language barrier.

As a result of these findings, the School Board was directed to file a plan of "appropriate action."

The court, in its earlier opinion, was careful to point out that it was dealing only with the statutory mandate as evidenced by the law passed by Congress and was not dealing with educational policy. It said: "It is not the intention of this court to tell educators how to educate, but only to see that this defendant carries out an obligation imposed by law to help

the teachers use existing knowledge as this may bear on appropriate action to overcome language barriers." (P. 41). It indicated that: "It is the intention of this court that the method of using the students' home language in teaching reading of standard English meet the test of reasonableness and rationality in light of knowledge on the subject." (P. 41). And it said: "It does not, however, seem to the court that the judicial forum is the appropriate place to make determinations of this sort [decision as to how to teach reading]. What is 'appropriate' is not what this court believes should be done in light of evidence presented in this case. The courts are not the place to test the validity of educational programs and pedagogical methods. It is not for the courts to harmonize conflicting objectives by making judgments involving issues of pedagogy." (P. 38).

These statements were an attempt to point out that the court was dealing with legal obligations imposed by Congress upon the School District Board. It was not attempting to dictate educational policy. Congress enacted the statute which was applied in this case. The court found that the Board did not comply with the statute. Had there been no statute of course,

there would have been nothing in the law on which to base the decision. It is the statute that gives direction as to what is required. The court reiterates these standards and the distinction between meeting the requirements of the law on the one hand and determining educational policy on the other in passing judgment on the School District Board's plan.

The statute requires that the Board take "appropriate action" to overcome language barriers which impede equal participation in instructional programs. This court has found that a language barrier exists which impedes the teachers' attempts to teach reading of standard English to students who speak "black English" in their homes. Therefore, because the statute specifically directs its attention at the School District Board, the court has directed that the School District Board provide a plan that the Board considers "appropriate action." Since the language barrier was found to be a barrier on the part of the teachers, the court suggested that the plan should be directed at assisting the teacher.

However, attention should not be diverted from the goal of an educational policy by the formal requirement of the statute. That goal is to teach the child to read. The

program's ultimate beneficiaries should be the children and, although the structure of the program must be directed at the teachers, the children must always be considered as the final recipients of the program and its success must be measured by their success in reading.

The plan before the court is the effort on the part of the defendant School District Board to provide a program to comply with the law. It is the court's obligation to determine if that plan complies with the law. It is not necessary nor would it be appropriate for the court to make judgments as to whether the plan is or is not the best plan to accomplish the purpose. To do so would put the court into a position of making judgments on what is sound educational policy and would make the court the arbiter of educational policy. This is not what § 1703(f) suggests. Section 1703(f) requires that the Board take appropriate action to overcome the language barriers. What action is appropriate should be judged simply in light of existing knowledge on the subject. If there is substantial existing knowledge on the subject that supports the position taken by the School District Board, then this court's obligation is to find that the plan complies with the law.

The plan submitted by the defendant in this case has as its goals the following:

A. help the professional staff of King Elementary School to appreciate and understand the features, characteristics, and background of black English dialect;

B. train the professional staff of King Elementary School to identify children in their classes who may speak black English as their only dialect, as a dominant dialect, or as a second dialect;

C. assist the staff at King Elementary School to respond appropriately to the needs of children who speak black English when providing instruction in reading standard English;

D. establish a consultation liaison with an external agent that insures ongoing exchange of the latest professional information on black English and its role in learning to read standard English;

E. help the professional staff of King Elementary School to better communicate to parents the continuing need for parental input and support.

To carry out these goals, the Board suggests a two-part plan. An inservice program for teachers of instruction in general language and dialect concepts including "the contrasting features of black English and standard English, the identification of black English speakers, the accommodation of code-switching needs in black English speakers, and the use of knowledge of dialect differences to help individual students read standard English. The plan will include both a formal motivational and instructional inservice component and a classroom reinforcement and implementation inservice component. These two components will insure that staff receive both the formal inservice instruction and the support and help in applying newly gained knowledge in the classrooms." 1/

1/ See Footnote 1/ material at conclusion of this Memorandum Opinion and Order.

The plan provides for a significant number of persons to manage and supervise the project and a method of evaluation, together with a budget to pay for its cost.

The plaintiffs have criticized the plan submitted by the School District Board in the following respects.

They suggest that an additional goal should be added to the plan in the following language: "help the professional staff of King Elementary School to implement the Humaneness Plan with specific concern for its application to black children whose home language differs from the English taught in public school." They also suggest that the parents of the plaintiff children should be consulted on a regular systematic basis in connection with the goals of the plan. They further suggest that where the plan calls for help to the teachers by the Language Arts Consultant "as requested by the teachers," the plan should provide this assistance on a "regularly scheduled basis" and that the Language Arts Consultant should bear the responsibility for "the securing of additional materials" instead of leaving this choice to the teachers with the help of the Language Arts Consultant. Plaintiffs also suggest that the teachers should be proscribed from providing any special assistance under the plan separately from the rest of the class. The plaintiffs also suggest

that the Supervision and Management team should include two representatives chosen by persons representing the plaintiff children and that "The mothers of the named plaintiff children shall be notified about the time and place of team meetings and permitted to attend." The plaintiffs also suggest that counsel representing the plaintiff children should have veto power over the selection of the external expert consultant in linguistics and reading.

These matters might be quite appropriate for inclusion in a plan of the kind envisioned by the court's earlier opinion and might be considered appropriate had they been proposed by the defendant School District Board. However, it is not the obligation of this court to determine educational policy. These matters involve a judgment regarding educational policy. For the court to step in and make a determination on any of these matters would inject the court into the matters of educational policy not envisioned by the congressional enactment. There is substantial evidence in the record to support the decision of the School Board on the proposals made by the Board. Although there is also substantial evidence to support suggestions made

by the plaintiffs, the educational policy is to be determined by the School District Board. The law is to be interpreted by this court. If the proposals are rational in light of existing knowledge as established in this case, they should be approved.

Finally, the plaintiffs suggest two additions not involving educational policy to the proposal made by the Board. They suggest that additional language should be inserted in the part of the plan dealing with the time schedule. The language suggested is as follows: "This plan shall satisfy the requirements of the court within the time period specified unless plaintiffs can demonstrate to the court that there has not been substantial compliance in good faith. If such a showing is made, this court may provide such other relief as is necessary to assure the implementation of its order of July 12, 1979." They also suggest that their counsel should also receive the evaluation reports when they are distributed.

The court believes that the suggested additional language is not necessary in the plan. It is clear that if the defendant School District Board makes an effort to subvert the

thrust of the court's earlier ruling, it can again be brought before this court for further action. On the other hand, it does seem appropriate to the court that plaintiffs' counsel should be permitted to see the evaluation reports that are distributed. This clearly is not a matter that deals with educational policy but deals specifically with providing information to help the court determine whether the program is being carried out properly within the framework of the law.

The court itself has some question about the adequacy of the plan proposed. The question does not involve itself with educational philosophy or policy but with the adequacy of the methods proposed to evaluate the plan. The plan suggests a method of evaluation as follows:

> Evaluation activities will concentrate on providing evidence 1) that the inservice program is being implemented in accordance with the plan, 2) that a good-faith effort is being made to comply with the Order, and 3) that the program is judged worthy of expansion to the other elementary schools of the district. All evaluation reports will be distributed to the Board of Education, His Honor, the Superintendent and his Cabinet, the project management team, and the King Elementary School staff. Evaluation reports will be available to the press and the community. The following activities are planned:

A. A written anecdotal summary of each inservice workshop will be prepared and distributed by the management team no later than five days following each inservice session. The summary will include: a list of participants present, an outline of major activities, and a summary of participant reactions.

B. A more general progress report will be issued by the management team every 60 days.

C. An evaluation questionnaire will be distributed to all participants at the close of each inservice workshop. These data will be summarized in the anecdotal summary of each workshop session.

D. A comprehensive survey of staff reactions will be administered at the close of the year.

E. An external expert consultant in linguistics and reading will visit a random sample of 50 percent of the teachers during reading class on at least two different occasions. In addition, the consultant will briefly interview each teacher following the observation. The purpose of the observation and interview is to determine the extent to which teachers are attempting to implement material presented in the inservice workshops. The consultant's reports will be general in nature and will not mention or allude to individual staff members.

This evaluation proposal is largely directed at an evaluation of the inservice training program. This is good but does not seem to the court to be sufficiently comprehensive to determine whether in the long run the action of the Board is "appropriate" as that term is used in the statute.

As pointed out before, the ultimate beneficiaries of the plan should be the children and a part of the effort of evaluation should be aimed at determining whether or not, and if so the extent to which, the children have been assisted in learning to read. In other words, an additional component should be added to the evaluation part of the plan. The Board must determine not only if the barriers are being overcome but also must determine if the impediments to equal participation in the instructional programs are being overcome (as evidenced by the students' progress in attaining reading skills). The court suggests specifically that the evaluation part of the plan be broadened to report changes in the reading skills of the children and if possible the effect the plan has had on these skills.

The court finds that the persons who drafted the plan are highly qualified educators and qualified to suggest a plan involving the education of the children in this case. It finds that the plan does take into consideration existing knowledge on the subject, and it is suggested in good faith to comply with the court's order of July 12, 1979. It seems to the court that the School District Board has suggested steps that are supported

by the evidence in this case and existing knowledge on the subject to help the teachers recognize the home language of the students and to use that knowledge in their attempts to teach reading skills in standard English, and to thus overcome the language barrier that was shown to exist in this case.

The court finds that, except as otherwise indicated herein, the plan meets the test of reasonableness and rationality in light of knowledge on the subject and that it embraces within its terms the persons directly involved in the education of the plaintiff children.

Finally, it should be indicated that the court is not approving or adopting the plan proposed but is indicating and declaring that in its judgment under the facts of this case, the plan as modified complies with the law as stated by Congress.

Having thus indicated its decision on the plan, it is appropriate again to underscore a major premise involved in the adoption of the statute and its application by this court to the facts of this case. This has been alluded to earlier in the court's opinion when attention was directed to the children in this case:

> A major goal of American education in general, and of King School in particular, is to train young people to communicate both orally (speaking and understanding oral speech) and in writing (reading and understanding the written word and writing so that others can understand it) in the standard vernacular of society. The art of communication among the people of the country in all aspects of people's lives is a basic building block in the development of each individual. Children need to learn to speak and understand and to read and write the language used by society to carry on its business, to develop its science, arts and culture, and to carry on its professions and governmental functions. Therefore, a major goal of a school system is to teach reading, writing, speaking and understanding standard English. (Court Order of July 12, 1979, p. 2 and 3).

It is the hope of this court that the wisdom of Congress in enacting this statute and this court's application of that statute to the facts of this case will be a step to keep another generation from becoming functionally illiterate. The court has recognized and the evidence suggests that there are in this case many other factors which adversely affect the process of learning to read. Absences from class, classroom misbehavior, learning disabilities, and emotional impairment contributed to this problem. It is also probable that lack of reading role models has a significant impact on the problem. The evidence

does suggest, however, that a coordinated program involving the appropriate use of programs available under other existing statutes, the skill and empathy of the King teachers, and the plan adopted by the School District Board in this case makes it likely that the problems can be diminished and that the goal of teaching reading in standard English can be achieved.

So ordered.

Dated: August 24, 1979
Detroit, Michigan

CHARLES W. JOINER
United States District Judge

FOOTNOTE

1/ Footnoted material referred to on page 8 of the Memorandum Opinion and Order.

The details of the plan are as follows:

A. Formal Instructional Component

1. Objectives: Upon completion of this formal instructional component, inservice participants should:

a. recognize generally the basic features of a language system as they apply to dialect differences.

b. be able to describe in general the concept of a dialect and dialect differences within the English language.

c. be sensitive to the value judgments about dialect differences which people often make and communicate to others.

d. be able to describe the basic linguistic features of black English as it contrasts with standard English.

e. show appreciation for the history and background of black English.

f. recognize readily children and adults speaking the black English dialect.

g. be able to identify without prompting the specific linguistic features by which they recognized a speaker of black English dialect.

h. be able to discuss knowledgeably the important linguistic issues in code switching between black English and standard written English.

i. be able to identify possible instructional strategies that can be used to aid children in code switching between black English and standard English.

j. use miscue analysis strategies to distinguish between a dialect shift and a decoding mistake when analyzing an oral reading sample.

k. be able to describe a variety of language experience activities that can be used to complement the linguistic basal reader program.

2. Operational Details: Instructional Component

a. A total of at least 20 hours of formal instruction will be provided at a time and place to be arranged in consultation with the principal and staff of King Elementary School and the Ann Arbor Education Association.

b. That instruction will commence on or about October 15, 1979, and be completed by no later than March 15, 1980, per a calendar of inservice sessions agreed to in consultation with the principal and staff of King Elementary School and the Ann Arbor Education Association.

c. The instructional team for this instructional component will include:

-- Dr. Thomas Pietras, Director of Language Arts, Ann Arbor Public Schools - Instructional Leader (See Résumé in Appendix B.)

-- King Elementary School Language Arts Consultant (to be named later)

-- An external consultant in linguistics and reading (to be named later)

-- Other Ann Arbor Public Schools elementary language arts consultants as needed

-- Specific King Elementary School professional staff with expertise to share

d. Specific instructional materials for the workshops will be drawn from the following pool of materials. Other materials may be substituted as they are identified.

RESOURCES

Abrahams, R. and R. Troike. Language and Cultural Diversity in American Education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1972.

Burling, Robbins. English in Black and White. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.

Cagney, Margaret A. "Children's Ability to Understand Standard English and Black Dialect." The Reading Teacher, Vol. 30, No. 6, March, 1977.

Cramer, Ronald L. "Dialectology--A Case for Language Experience." Reading Teacher, October, 1971, pp. 33-40.

Goodman, Kenneth S. and Catherine Buck. "Dialect Barriers to Reading Comprehension Revisited." The Reading Teacher, October, 1973, pp. 6-12.

Goodman, Yetta M. and Rudine Sims. "Whose Dialect for Beginning Readers?" Elementary English, Vol. 51, September, 1974, pp. 837-841.

Hoover, Mary Rhodes. "Characteristics of Black Schools at Grade Level: A Description." The Reading Teacher, April, 1972.

Johnson, Kenneth R. "Black Dialect Shift in Oral Reading." Journal of Reading, April, 1975, pp. 535-540.

Johnson, Kenneth R. and Herbert D. Simons. "Black Children's Reading of Dialect and Standard Texts. A Final Report." April, 1973, E.D. 076978.

Laffey, James and Roger Shuy. Language Differences: Do They Interfere? International Reading Association, 1973.

Pietras, Thomas P. "Teaching As a Linguistic Process in a Cultural Setting." To be published by The Clearinghouse, 1979.

Pietras, Thomas P. "Teacher Expectancy Via Language Attitudes: Pygmalion from a Sociolinguistic Point of View." The Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest, Vol. II, Nos. 3 and 4, December, 1977.

Pietras, Thomas P. "Teacher's Verbal and Nonverbal Behavior as Indices of Teacher Expectancy." Resources in Education, November, 1978, Educational Research Information Clearinghouse, No. ED 156627.

Postman, Neil and Charles Weingartner. Linguistics: A Revolution in Teaching. Delta Book (paperback), 1966.

Shuy, Roger. Discovering American Dialects. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967.

Audio and/or video-taped samples of spoken black English.

e. All King Elementary School professional staff will receive a stipend for their participation beyond the contractual day as agreed upon with the Ann Arbor Education Association.

f. Participants will include all professional staff who are regularly assigned to King Elementary School. Staff who have completed a formal course in black English from a recognized college or university and whose transcript so indicates may be excused from this component of the inservice program. Staff in art, music, and physical education will not be expected to attend those workshop sessions that deal specifically with reading instruction.

5. Classroom Application Component

1. Objectives: Upon completion of this component, inservice participants should:

a. be able, using a variety of informal techniques, to identify students in their class who speak black English;

b. be able to recognize specific problems encountered by individual black English speakers attempting to read standard English;

c. be able, in the classroom setting, to distinguish between a dialect shift and a decoding mistake as a black English speaking student is orally reading from standard English material;

d. have incorporated into their reading program appropriate language-experience activities;

e. use a variety of possible instructional strategies to help black English speaking students learn to read standard English.

2. Operational Details: Implementation Component

a. A series of 3 or 4 one hour follow-up seminars will be scheduled for appropriate Wednesday afternoons as selected by the principal and staff beginning in February and extending until the end of the school year. These seminars will have the purpose of encouraging classroom teachers to help each other with problems encountered in applying what they have learned in the workshops. It will also allow for the introduction of

outside expertise to help address these problems as the staff sees the need.

b. For the 1979-80 school year, a language arts consultant will be assigned full time to King Elementary School. The individual so assigned will have a strong background in reading, extensive knowledge of black English, and experience in teaching black English speaking students. During this period (1979-80), the Language Arts Consultant will have an expanded role. The Language Arts Consultant:

-- will carry an instructional caseload of five to ten high-need students (including but not exclusively black English speaking students);

-- will provide diagnostic help with individual students as requested by the teachers;

-- may work in the classrooms with the teachers during reading instruction (at the teacher's request);

-- may demonstrate in the classroom instructional strategies introduced in the seminar (at the teacher's request);

-- will secure additional materials as requested by the classroom teachers;

-- will either personally help or secure other assistance for a teacher who requests further inservice instruction in an area introduced in the workshops.

c. This component will be required of all professional staff who have either a direct or related responsibility

for reading instruction.

d. The instructional team for the implementation component will include:

-- Mrs. Rachel Schreiber, Principal, King Elementary School (Instructional Leader)

-- The King Elementary School Language Arts Consultant

-- Other Ann Arbor Public Schools Language Arts Consultants as invited

-- An external expert consultant in reading (to be identified later)

-- Dr. Thomas Pietras, Director of Language Arts, Ann Arbor Public Schools

-- Specific King School teachers who wish to share expertise with colleagues

e. King Elementary School staff will not receive a professional inservice stipend for this component, since it is expected that the work can be carried out within the contractual day.

C. The Reading Program at King Elementary School

Since His Honor has requested that the plan speak to "the exact steps to be taken . . . (2) to use that knowledge in teaching such students how to read standard English," it is appropriate that we describe briefly the reading program at King Elementary School, first, because it is changing this year as the district implements a more contemporary reading program, and second, because the inservice program will highlight certain features of that program.

1. The staff at King Elementary School have selected and are in the process of implementing the linguistic basal reading program produced by the Houghton-Mifflin Company. Following is a description of that program prepared by Dr. Pietras:

The Houghton-Mifflin Reading Program

As children approach the task of learning to read, they have as their main challenge "breaking the code" in reading. This process has two (2) essential parts which are: (1) phonics (accurately associating letters with the sounds they symbolize) and (2) comprehension (extracting meaning from what is read).

The Houghton-Mifflin Program provides these two parts. The kindergarten through grade six component of this basal reading series can be divided into three sections:

1. The pre-reading section called "reading readiness," provides skills basic to beginning reading such as auditory and visual discrimination between sounds and letters, left to right progression, beginning development of listening and oral skills.
2. The primary section (grades 1-3) emphasizes basic skills such as word attack, listening, and specific comprehension exercises children need to master if they are to learn to read.
3. The intermediate section (grades 4-6) lessens the emphasis on word-attack skills and begins to stress comprehension, study, and literary-appreciation skills. Children need to master these so they can: (1) cope with extracting meaning from

reading material independently, (2) study informative material effectively, (3) use reference aids efficiently, and (4) read for different purposes.

---

2. The Houghton-Mifflin Reading Management system is also being implemented at King Elementary School to complement the basal program. This system of developmental reading skills and periodic progress tests provides careful monitoring of each child's reading skill development. The system supplements and corroborates the teacher's professional insights as he/she works with each child.
3. Language-experience activities are used as a supplement and complement to the basal program as appropriate. Many such language-experience activities are already described in the Houghton-Mifflin manual. Such experiences are particularly beneficial to black English speaking students who are having code-switching difficulties.
4. Additional reading materials are provided in each classroom to supplement the basal reading program. Particular attention is given to materials which provide additional practice in hearing sound-symbol relationships (phonics).
5. The library is constantly used to provide a rich source of student books for sustained silent reading.

We are of the opinion that this approach to reading instruction is reasonable and rational in light of knowledge on the subject. In that regard, two very recent reports corroborate our views:

Kean, Michael H., et al. What Works in Reading: The Results of a Joint School District/Federal Reserve Bank Empirical Study in Philadelphia. Office of Research and Evaluation, Philadelphia Public Schools, May, 1979.

Hoover, Mary Rhodes. "Characteristics of Black Schools at Grade Level: A Description." The Reading Teacher, Vol. 31, No. 7, April, 1978.

VI. Implementation Details

A. Timeline

1. It is expected that the entire program can be completed in one school year (1979-80).
2. Component No. 1: Motivation and Instruction will run from about October 15, 1979, to no later than March 15, 1980.
3. Component No. 2: Reinforcement and Implementation will run from about December 1, 1979, to June 15, 1980.

B. Resources and Materials

1. Each inservice participant will receive individual copies of selected materials to be studied closely in the workshops.
2. A modest professional library of carefully selected books and articles will be available from the King Elementary School media center.
3. Prepared tapes of black English and contrasting standard English language samples will be available in the King School media center.
4. A full-time Language Arts Consultant will be assigned to King Elementary School for the 1979-80 school year. This

represents an expansion of .5 full-time staff equivalent over what is normally available at King Elementary School.

5. At least 40 hours of external expert consultant time in both linguistics and reading will be contracted.

6. Fifteen percent of Dr. Pietras' time and five percent of Dr. Hansen's and Dr. Cranmore's time will be dedicated to the project.

7. A professional inservice stipend will be provided to each teacher to compensate for time spent in the program beyond the contractual day.

C. Supervision and Management

1. The project will be supervised by a management team consisting of the following people:

-- Dr. Lee H. Hansen, Associate Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction (Team Leader) (See résumé in Appendix B.)

-- Dr. Robert Potts, Assistant Superintendent for Human Relations and Community Services (See résumé in Appendix B.)

-- Mrs. Rachel Schreiber, Principal, King Elementary School

-- Dr. Marion Cranmore, Director of Elementary Education

-- Dr. Thomas Pietras, Director of Language Arts (See résumé in Appendix B.)

-- King Elementary School Ann Arbor Education Association Representative

-- Two (2) King Elementary School teachers selected at large by the staff

-- King Elementary School Language Arts Consultant

-- Citizen-at-large: Dr. Percy Bates, Associate Dean, School of Education, The University of Michigan

2. This team will meet at least once every three weeks to monitor progress, to solve problems, and to plan the details of future activities.